

~~SECRET~~

Notes on Project 37.2083

Foreword., para. 2, ll. 4-5

Meaning of "direct evidence" and "open source information" not clear.
Is open source information indirect evidence?

Summary, para. 1

Does Gosplan as a whole do the missile staff work or is there in
turn a missiles section in Gosplan?

p. 2, last sent. of continued para.

Insert: daily

p. 6, last para., 1st sent.

Why not call it a special "State" GM Committee, since this is the
way it is referred to in the Summary, above, and Chart I.

p. 8, footnote

Listed where? Explain the difference between the first and second
branches.

Should the second sentence state that they are also believed to
be responsible for the sensitive programs?

p. 8a, para 2

Well argued, but fails to go far enough to make the ultimate point
that needs to be made if the paper is to have maximum operational value,
i.e., the disclosure not only of what and how things must be done, but
who probably does them. Can't it be reasoned that regardless of whether
there is a formal or an ad hoc missiles committee, it must draw its
support from the other State Committees named? Therefore these committees
necessarily become targets for missile collection.

p. 10

Locate footnote.

p. 11, para. 1

Singular/plural and past/present dichotomies are confusing and
unnecessary. Note suggested simplification.

p. 12, l. 16

Can you spell out why the "first branch," in terms of its other
known responsibilities?

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

Notes, continued

p. 15, ll. 7-8

Why least likely?

p. 15, ll. 13-17

Contradicts ll. 5-6 above, which state that consumption is already quite low.

p. 13, Chart 2, first note

Appears to contradict pp. 6-10 above, which gives the State Committee for Guided Missiles the basic planning authority.

p. 16, ll. 20-22

Assigns State Committee for Guided Missiles (note conflict in terminology with Part II above) a much lesser note than that assigned above, p. 8b.

p. 18, last para.

Is it likely that the SCFPM (hereafter referred to as MC) would engage in sufficient plant construction to justify its having a plant designing institute of its own? What is the likelihood of this being turned out to the State Committee for Construction through its member on the MC (See Chart I)?

p. 20a, l. 3

For "plans," substitute "estimates"?

Pp. 19-22

Note differences in ascribed participation of the MC in cost estimating, financial planning, and transport planning. Only in transport planning is the MC said to participate.

p. 23

Good summary. Clears up several questions raised above, but these earlier statements should be reconciled with this summary.

Shouldn't this Section be headed: "C. Summary of Policy Proposal and Planning"? See titles for A and B.

p. 25.

Make it either Stage I or Phase I, but not both.

SECRET

SECRET

Notes, continued

p. 26, and p. 38

Good, but should the Gosplan be shown on a par with the State Committees?

p. 35, ll. 8-12

Sentence not clear. Is "changes" the intended word on l. 11?

p. 41

A number of new actors have suddenly appeared on the stage. Where were the Union Republic Gosplan, the Council of Ministers, and the State Committee for Defense Technology during the planning phase discussed in Part III?

p. 41, ll. 15-17

How can the techprocfin plan be examined by the Gosplan while the plan is in the MC?

p. 45, ll. 16, 22

I believe that to this point all references have been to the State bank, not the Gosbank. Will collectors know that the two are the same?

p. 47, ll. 17-18

Is the "settlement account" as a whole divided into two parts or is it the debit side that is divided into two parts?

p. 52, l. 6

Basic information is where? In the defense section of Gosplan or in the aggregated sectional materials plan? Won't it be "buried" once it is aggregated?

p. 55, l. 17

Subordination omitted. Shouldn't it read, Known only to the . . . of the Gosplan, USSR.

p. 58, l. 17

Does one launch missile systems?

SECRET